IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA SOUTHERN DIVISION

CHRISDEON BYRD, #311793,)
Plaintiff,))
v.) Case No. 1:19-CV-946-ECM-WC
HOUSTON COUNTY, et al.,)
HOUSTON COUNTT, et al.,)
Defendants)

RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Plaintiff initiated this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action challenging conditions at the Houston County Jail. However, Plaintiff did not file the \$350 filing fee and \$50 administrative fee applicable when a plaintiff is not proceeding *in forma pauperis*, nor did he submit an original affidavit in support of a motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* accompanied by the required documentation from the inmate account clerk at the Houston County Jail regarding the average monthly deposits and average monthly balance in his inmate account for the six month period prior to filing this case. Thus, the documents filed by Plaintiff failed to provide the court with the information necessary for a determination of whether he should be allowed to proceed without prepayment of fees in this civil action.

Based on the foregoing, the court entered an order requiring Plaintiff to submit an appropriate affidavit in support of a motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay the requisite filing/administrative fees. Doc. 3. In this order, the court specifically cautioned Plaintiff "that if he fails to comply with this order the Magistrate Judge will

recommend that this case be dismissed." Doc. 3 at 2. The time for Plaintiff to file a response to this order has expired.

As of the present date, Plaintiff has failed to file the necessary financial information. Absent either pre-payment of the requisite fees or the granting of *in forma pauperis* status, this case cannot proceed before this court. The undersigned therefore concludes that this case is due to be dismissed without prejudice. See Moon v. Newsome, 863 F.2d 835, 837 (11th Cir. 1989) (holding that, generally, where a litigant has been forewarned, dismissal for failure to obey a court order is not an abuse of discretion). The authority of courts to impose sanctions for failure to prosecute or obey an order is longstanding and acknowledged by Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. See Link v. Wabash R.R. Co., 370 U.S. 626, 629–30 (1962). This authority empowers the courts "to manage their own affairs so as to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases." Link, 370 U.S. at 630–31; *Mingo v. Sugar Cane Growers Co-Op of Fla.*, 864 F.2d 101, 102 (11th Cir. 1989) (holding that "[t]he district court possesses the inherent power to police its docket"). "The sanctions imposed [upon dilatory litigants] can range from a simple reprimand to an order dismissing the action with or without prejudice." Mingo, 864 F.2d at 102.

Accordingly, it is the RECOMMENDATION of the Magistrate Judge that this case be DISMISSED without prejudice for Plaintiff's failure to file necessary financial information as ordered by this court. Further, it is

ORDERED that the parties shall file any objections to this Recommendation on or before January 24, 2020. A party must specifically identify the factual findings and legal

conclusions in the Recommendation to which objection is made; frivolous, conclusive, or

general objections will not be considered. Plaintiff is advised that this Recommendation

is not a final order of the court and, therefore, it is not appealable.

Failure to file written objections to the Magistrate Judge's findings and

recommendations in accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) shall bar a

party from a de novo determination by the District Court of legal and factual issues covered

in the Recommendation and waives the right of the party to challenge on appeal the district

court's order based on unobjected-to factual and legal conclusions accepted or adopted by

the District Court except upon grounds of plain error or manifest injustice. Nettles v.

Wainwright, 677 F.2d 404 (5th Cir. 1982); 11TH CIR. R. 3-1. See Stein v. Lanning

Securities, Inc., 667 F.2d 33 (11th Cir. 1982). See also Bonner v. City of Prichard, 661

F.2d 1206 (11th Cir. 1981) (en banc).

DONE this 10th day of January, 2020.

/s/ Wallace Capel, Jr.

WALLACE CAPEL, JR.

CHIEF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

3